The Authority Capture Mechanism

How Strategic Actors Across Civilizations Seized Positions ofSymbolic Authority to Exploit Accumulated Trust

Thomas J. Bryan

2026

Part of the collection

Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations

Abstract

Positions of symbolic authority—the papacy, the cardinalate, the caliphate, the high priesthood—do not emerge fully formed. They are built over generations, sometimes centuries, through the genuine service of individuals who fulfill the function the position was designed to perform. Priests minister to the faithful. Caliphs guide the community of believers. High priests maintain the cosmic order. Each generation of faithful service deposits trust into the position itself, creating what this paper terms *accumulated institutional trust*—a reservoir of credibility that attaches to the office rather than to any individual occupant.

This accumulated trust represents an extraordinary resource. It functions as a verification override: populations conditioned over lifetimes to defer to the position's authority do not evaluate individual occupants with the same skepticism they would apply to an unknown claimant. The robes, the title, the architectural setting—these bypass the cognitive security system that would otherwise require each new occupant to earn trust independently. The position carries trust forward automatically, transferring it to whoever occupies the office.

This paper identifies and documents a pattern that recurs across civilizations, religious traditions, and historical periods: strategic actors who recognize the exploitable value of accumulated institutional trust and deliberately seek positions of symbolic authority not to serve the function the position was designed for, but to leverage the verification override that generations of genuine service have built into the office. The Borgia family's systematic capture of the papacy, Cardinal Richelieu's deliberate pursuit of ecclesiastical rank as a vehicle for political power, Cardinal Wolsey's accumulation of religious titles to shield secular ambition, the Umayyad dynasty's seizure of the caliphate by a family that had actively opposed the Prophet, the High Priests of Amun who transformed Egypt's most sacred religious office into an economic empire rivaling the pharaoh—these are not isolated cases of individual corruption. They are instances of a universal mechanism: the capture of symbolic authority positions by actors whose intentions diverge fundamentally from the position's original function.

The consistency of this pattern across civilizations that had no contact with one another—medieval Christendom, the early Islamic caliphate, pharaonic Egypt, feudal Japan, imperial China—demonstrates convergent evolution rather than cultural diffusion. Strategic actors in radically different societies independently discovered the same insight: that occupying a position of accumulated symbolic authority is the most efficient path to power, because the position's trust infrastructure does the work that would otherwise require either persuasion or force.

I. The Trust Deposit Problem

Every institution that endures across generations faces a peculiar vulnerability that its founders could not have anticipated. The vulnerability is not corruption in the ordinary sense—not the gradual erosion of standards or the slow creep of self-interest into institutional practice. It is something more fundamental and more dangerous: the institution's own success in building trust creates a resource that actors with entirely different intentions can exploit.

Consider what happens when a religious office functions as intended for several generations. A succession of genuine spiritual leaders occupies the position, each serving the community faithfully, each reinforcing the population's conditioning that the position's occupant speaks with legitimate authority. Parents tell their children to respect the office. Rituals reinforce deference to the title. Architecture communicates the grandeur and seriousness of the institution. Over decades and centuries, trust accumulates not in any individual but in the position itself—in the robes, the title, the setting, the entire symbolic apparatus that surrounds whoever happens to occupy the office.

This accumulated trust functions precisely as described in the verification override framework: it selectively disables the population's critical evaluation of claims made by the office's occupant. When the priest speaks, the congregation does not evaluate his claims with the same rigor they would apply to a stranger making identical assertions. When the caliph issues a decree, the faithful do not subject it to the same scrutiny they would direct at a merchant's promise. The position has earned this deference through generations of genuine service. The trust is real. It was legitimately deposited by predecessors who deserved it.

But here is the vulnerability: the trust attaches to the position, not the person. And positions can be occupied by anyone who can secure appointment, election, inheritance, or seizure. The trust that took generations to accumulate transfers automatically to the new occupant—regardless of whether that occupant intends to serve the function the position was designed to perform or to exploit the trust infrastructure for entirely different purposes.

This is the authority capture mechanism. It is not a conspiracy theory about corrupt individuals infiltrating good institutions. It is a structural analysis of how the very success of symbolic authority positions in building trust creates exploitable resources that attract actors whose intentions diverge from the position's original function. The mechanism operates identically whether the position is the papacy, the caliphate, the high priesthood of Amun, or any other office that has accumulated institutional trust over time.

• • •

The authority capture mechanism has three components that distinguish it from ordinary institutional corruption.

First, **the capture is deliberate.** The actors examined in this paper did not stumble into positions of symbolic authority and then gradually succumb to temptation. They identified the position's trust infrastructure as a strategic resource and pursued the position specifically to access that resource. Richelieu did not become a cardinal and then discover that the robes were politically useful. He sought the cardinalate because he understood what the robes could do. The Borgia family did not produce a pope by accident. They spent decades positioning family members within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, understanding that the papacy's accumulated trust was the most valuable political asset in Christendom.

Second, **the capture exploits a gap between the position's function and the occupant's intention.** The position was designed to serve a specific function—spiritual leadership, religious interpretation, cosmic mediation. The capturing actor intends to use the position for something else entirely—political power, family enrichment, territorial expansion, economic extraction. The population continues to trust the position because they assume the occupant is serving the original function. The gap between assumption and reality is the space within which the capturing actor operates.

Third, **the capture depends on the verification override remaining active.** If the population evaluated each new occupant independently—assessing whether this

particular individual genuinely served the position's intended function—the capture would fail. But the accumulated trust operates precisely by disabling that evaluation. The population does not assess the occupant. They defer to the position. And the position's trust transfers automatically, protecting the capturing actor from the scrutiny that would expose the divergence between function and intention.

II. The Cardinals Who Were Not Priests: Authority Capture in Christendom

The Borgia Strategy: Making the Papacy Hereditary

The Borgia family's capture of the papacy is among the most thoroughly documented cases of deliberate authority capture in Western history, precisely because contemporaries recognized what was happening even as they proved unable to prevent it. The pattern begins not with Rodrigo Borgia—the future Pope Alexander VI—but with his uncle, Alfonso de Borgia, who became Pope Callixtus III in 1455. Alfonso's papacy was itself unremarkable in terms of authority capture; he appears to have been a legitimately pious man who reached the office through conventional ecclesiastical advancement. But his elevation opened a door that his nephew would walk through with very different intentions.

Within a year of his uncle's election, the twenty-five-year-old Rodrigo was made a cardinal—not because of spiritual distinction or theological accomplishment, but because his uncle was pope and the family recognized the strategic value of placing another Borgia within the Church's power structure. The Catholic Encyclopedia notes with characteristic understatement that Rodrigo was "obtruded upon the Church, the question of a clerical vocation being left completely out of consideration." He was, in other words, inserted into a position of symbolic authority without any intention of serving the function that position was designed to perform.

What followed was thirty-five years of patient accumulation. As Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Catholic Church—a position of enormous administrative power and revenue—Rodrigo Borgia served under five successive popes, positioning himself as kingmaker in four papal elections. He supported candidates who would maintain his position, built networks of obligation among the cardinals, and accumulated the wealth necessary to mount his own bid when the moment arrived. In 1492, that moment came. Rodrigo emerged from the conclave as Pope Alexander VI.

The significance of this sequence for understanding authority capture lies in the gap between what the papacy represented to the population and what it represented to the

Borgia family. To the faithful, the papacy was the Vicar of Christ—the supreme spiritual authority in Christendom, the occupant of a position built over fourteen centuries of accumulated trust. The papal tiara, the vestments, the rituals of election, the architectural grandeur of the Vatican—all of this constituted a verification override of extraordinary power. When the pope spoke, the faithful did not evaluate his claims as they would evaluate any other person's assertions. The position carried trust that bypassed individual assessment.

To the Borgias, the papacy was something else entirely: the most powerful political office in Europe, carrying with it not only temporal authority over the Papal States but a verification override that could shield virtually any action behind the presumption of spiritual legitimacy. Alexander VI used the office for what historians have uniformly described as family aggrandizement. He enriched his children. His son Cesare was made a cardinal and then, when military ambitions required it, resigned the cardinalate to carve out a personal principality from papal territories. His daughter Lucrezia was married three times for political advantage. Rich cardinals and noblemen were accused of fabricated crimes, imprisoned or killed, and their property confiscated by the pope. The papacy—a position designed to shepherd the spiritual lives of millions—became an instrument of dynastic expansion.

And the verification override held. Despite widespread awareness among the Roman elite that Alexander was corrupt, the broader population continued to defer to papal authority. The trust was too deeply deposited, the conditioning too thoroughly installed, the override too firmly embedded in the population's cognitive architecture. Contemporaries wrote with dismay about the divergence between the office's function and the occupant's behavior, but the divergence itself demonstrates the mechanism: the position's accumulated trust protected the capturing actor from the scrutiny that would have destroyed an ordinary political figure engaged in identical conduct.

Richelieu: The Red Eminence as Political Technology

If the Borgias demonstrate authority capture through family strategy applied across generations, Armand Jean du Plessis—Cardinal Richelieu—demonstrates something

more precise: a single individual's conscious recognition that ecclesiastical rank was a political technology, and his deliberate pursuit of that technology as the vehicle for an ambition that had nothing to do with spiritual service.

Historians have been remarkably direct about this. Richelieu did not originally want a career in the Church. He had, in the language of his biographers, a thirst for power and saw religious positions as the means of achieving it. His family held the bishopric of Luçon through royal grant—a common arrangement in which ecclesiastical offices were distributed as political patronage rather than spiritual appointments. When Richelieu took up the bishopric, he was too young to be consecrated and required a special papal dispensation. The position was not a calling. It was a platform.

From bishop to cardinal to chief minister of France, Richelieu's trajectory illustrates authority capture with unusual clarity because his actions as chief minister bore no discernible relationship to the spiritual function of the cardinalate. He allied Catholic France with Protestant powers against the Catholic Habsburgs in the Thirty Years' War—a decision that subordinated religious identity entirely to political calculation. He crushed the feudal nobility, established absolute monarchy, created an extensive surveillance network, controlled all publications through the Académie Française and state-licensed gazettes, and executed political rivals through manipulated judicial proceedings. These were the actions of a political operator of the first rank. They were not the actions of a spiritual leader.

Yet Richelieu operated throughout as a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, and this was not incidental to his power—it was foundational to it. The cardinal's robes carried a verification override that had been accumulating for over a millennium. French populations conditioned since childhood to defer to ecclesiastical authority did not evaluate Richelieu's political actions with the same critical rigor they would have applied to a secular minister pursuing identical policies. The robes placed him in a category that the population's skepticism system was programmed to exempt from ordinary political scrutiny. He was known as the "Red Eminence"—a title that derived directly from the cardinal's vestments—and contemporaries criticized him by calling him "king" rather than "caliph," an accusation that he was using a religious office for secular kingship. The

accusation was accurate. But the override held. The robes made him invisible as a political operator in precisely the way a secular minister would have been visible.

Wolsey: The Butcher's Son in Cardinal's Robes

Thomas Wolsey's career provides a third variation on the Christian pattern, one that illuminates a dimension the Borgia and Richelieu cases do not: the use of ecclesiastical authority as a vehicle for social mobility that would have been impossible through secular channels alone.

Wolsey was the son of a butcher in Ipswich—a social origin that, in early sixteenth-century England, would have permanently excluded him from the highest levels of political power through any conventional path. The English nobility controlled access to the court, to military command, to the great offices of state, and they guarded that access jealously. A butcher's son could not become Lord Chancellor through secular advancement. The verification override attached to noble birth—the assumption that breeding conferred the right to rule—would have filtered Wolsey out long before he reached the proximity to power that his ambitions required.

But the Church offered a different pathway, one in which the verification override attached to ecclesiastical rank could override the verification override attached to birth. Wolsey was ordained a priest in 1498 and, through a combination of administrative talent, relentless work, and strategic positioning, rose through ecclesiastical ranks with extraordinary speed. Bishop of Lincoln in 1514. Archbishop of York that same year. Cardinal in 1515, by appointment of Pope Leo X. Papal legate in 1518, with authority to act on the Pope's behalf—and, in 1524, legate for life, making him the most powerful churchman in England, outranking even the Archbishop of Canterbury.

These ecclesiastical titles were not ends in themselves. They were the trust infrastructure that enabled Wolsey to hold the position he actually wanted: Lord Chancellor of England, effectively Henry VIII's sole minister and the most powerful political figure in the kingdom after the king himself. For fourteen years, Wolsey exercised power that contemporaries described as unprecedented for any Crown servant in English history. He was called the "alter rex"—the other king. He controlled the flow

of official information to the monarch. He established the parameters of every major policy debate. He built Hampton Court Palace, a residence so magnificent that when Henry VIII eventually visited it, the king was astounded at its opulence.

The ecclesiastical titles did the work. A butcher's son holding the title of Lord Chancellor on secular merit alone would have faced constant challenge from the nobility, who believed that political power was their birthright. But a cardinal—a prince of the Church—occupied a category that the nobility's own conditioning programmed them to respect, however grudgingly. The cardinal's robes carried a verification override that trumped the override attached to noble birth. Wolsey's enemies hated him, and they hated him specifically because his ecclesiastical rank placed him beyond the social scrutiny that would have destroyed a secular rival of common origin. The religious office was the shield. Without it, the butcher's son could never have become the other king.

III. The Caliphate as Political Technology: Authority Capture in Islam

The Umayyads: From Opponents of the Prophet to "Deputies of God"

The Umayyad dynasty's capture of the Islamic caliphate represents one of the most dramatic examples of authority capture in world history, because the historical record preserves an unusually clear picture of the gap between the capturing actors' relationship to the institution's original function and their subsequent exploitation of its accumulated trust.

The Umayyad family, centered on the powerful Meccan clan of Banu Umayya, were among the most prominent opponents of the Prophet Muhammad during the early years of Islam. Historical tradition records that most members of the family accepted Islam only at the last moment, when it became clear that the Prophet would be victorious. Their conversion was, in the language of Islamic historiography, strategic rather than sincere—a recognition that the new religious movement had become too powerful to resist, not a genuine embrace of its spiritual content. Once inside the Muslim community, however, they exploited circumstances and, through what scholars have described as skilful political manipulation not entirely free from trickery, obtained power—displacing those whose claims to leadership were based on long service to Islam, piety, and relationship to the Prophet.

The pivotal figure was Mu'awiya ibn Abi Sufyan, who served as governor of Syria under the early caliphs and claimed the caliphate for himself in 661 CE after the assassination of Ali, the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law. What made this seizure an act of authority capture rather than ordinary political succession was Mu'awiya's transformation of the office. The caliphate had been understood by the early Muslim community as a position of religious and political leadership held by individuals chosen for their piety, knowledge, and service to Islam. Mu'awiya made it hereditary—an unprecedented move that turned the office of caliph into kingship, in the contemptuous language of later Islamic scholars.

More revealing still was the Umayyads' conscious manipulation of the office's symbolic apparatus. Mu'awiya and his successors adopted the title *khalīfat allāh*—"Deputy of God"—rather than the more modest titles used by earlier caliphs. This was a conscious effort to confer religious legitimacy and acquire a religious aura that the family's actual history could not support. The Umayyads understood that the caliphate carried a verification override built through decades of genuine spiritual leadership by the Prophet and his immediate successors. By occupying the position and adopting its most elevated symbolic markers, they could access that override—shielding political actions behind the presumption of religious authority.

Contemporary critics saw clearly what was happening. Later Islamic sources contemptuously refer to Umayyad rule as mere "kingship" (*mulk*) rather than legitimate caliphate—an accusation that the Umayyads had captured the position's symbolic authority while abandoning its spiritual function. The observation was precise: unlike a king, whose power rests openly on force and political skill, a caliph's authority rests on the presumption of religious legitimacy. By claiming the title while pursuing purely political objectives, the Umayyads exploited the gap between the office's function (spiritual leadership of the Muslim community) and the occupant's intention (dynastic power and territorial control).

Abd al-Malik, who ruled from 685 to 705, pushed the capture further by claiming authority to create religious law—a prerogative that extended the caliphate's verification override into domains where the Umayyads' actual religious credentials were weakest. The pattern is structurally identical to what the Borgias accomplished in Christendom: a family with political rather than spiritual ambitions captured the institution that carried the deepest accumulated trust, adopted its symbolic apparatus, and exploited the resulting verification override to pursue objectives that had nothing to do with the position's original function.

The Shadow Caliphs of Cairo: Trust Infrastructure Without Power

An equally revealing case appears at the other end of the spectrum. After the Mongol destruction of Baghdad in 1258, the Abbasid caliphate was reconstituted in Cairo under

the Mamluk sultans—but in a form that strips the authority capture mechanism to its essential structure. The Abbasid caliphs in Cairo held no political power whatsoever. They maintained the symbols of authority—the titles, the ceremonial functions, the appearance of religious legitimacy—while real power was exercised entirely by the Mamluk military elite.

The arrangement was explicitly transactional. The Mamluk sultans needed the caliphate's accumulated trust to legitimize their own rule. The caliphs needed Mamluk protection to maintain their ceremonial existence. Historical analysis of this period makes the function explicit: past rulers had spread the notion of religious justification for the caliphate so that they could use religion as a shield protecting thrones against the attacks of rebels. The caliphate had been reduced to pure trust infrastructure—a verification override detached from any genuine religious function, maintained solely because the override itself was useful to those who controlled it.

This is authority capture in its most transparent form. The position existed only because the trust it carried was valuable to political actors who needed legitimation. The spiritual function was entirely absent. The accumulated trust—deposited over centuries by caliphs who had genuinely led the Muslim community—was being withdrawn for purposes its original depositors never intended. And the mechanism worked, for over two hundred and fifty years, precisely because the trust attached to the position rather than to the individuals who occupied it.

IV. The High Priests of Amun: When the Override Becomes the State

Ancient Egypt provides a case of authority capture that differs from the Christian and Islamic examples in a crucial respect: instead of political actors capturing religious positions to shield secular ambitions, religious office-holders gradually accumulated so much economic and political power that the capture became indistinguishable from state formation. The High Priests of Amun at Karnak did not merely exploit the verification override attached to their position. They built the override into an autonomous power base that eventually rivaled and, for a time, replaced the pharaoh's authority over much of Egypt.

The process unfolded over centuries, and its gradual nature is itself instructive. The priesthood of Amun rose to prominence during the early Eighteenth Dynasty, approximately 1550 BCE, through significant royal tributes to the god Amun by rulers such as Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The relationship between pharaoh and priesthood was, initially, one of mutual reinforcement: the pharaoh funded the temple and appointed its leaders; the priesthood legitimated the pharaoh's divine authority and maintained the cosmic order. The trust flowed in both directions.

But the temple's accumulation of resources gradually shifted the balance. By the reign of Ramesses III, around 1186 BCE, the temple of Amun at Karnak controlled an economic empire of staggering proportions: 433 orchards, 421,000 head of livestock, 65 villages, 83 ships, 46 workshops, hundreds of acres of farmland, and a labor force of more than 81,000 people. The Amun priesthood owned two-thirds of all temple lands in Egypt and ninety percent of her ships. The priests of the various cults, scholars have noted, held more power and wealth than the pharaoh.

The authority capture here operated through the position's religious function rather than against it. The High Priest of Amun was, by title and tradition, the chief prophet or interpreter of the god's will. This interpretive authority—the exclusive claim to know what Amun wanted—constituted a verification override of extraordinary potency. The pharaoh derived his legitimacy from divine sanction. If the priests controlled interpretation of the divine will, they controlled the mechanism through which the

pharaoh's own authority was legitimated. This gave the priesthood leverage that no secular rival could match: the ability to validate or invalidate the ruler's claim to power by declaring that the god approved or disapproved.

By the end of the New Kingdom, the High Priests of Amun had made this leverage explicit. Herihor, proclaimed as the first ruling High Priest of Amun around 1080 BCE, effectively governed Upper Egypt as a theocratic state. The god Amun became the actual ruler of Thebes in practice: civic and criminal cases, matters of policy, domestic issues, and building decisions were all made by Amun—whose will was interpreted and implemented by the priests. A regular Festival of the Divine Audience took place at Karnak where the god's statue communicated through oracles, nodding assent when it agreed with propositions put before it. The priests who controlled the statue controlled the oracle. The verification override had become the state itself.

Subsequent pharaohs recognized the threat and attempted counter-measures. Akhenaten's famous religious revolution—his attempt to replace the cult of Amun with monotheistic worship of the Aten—was, scholars now argue, at least partly an effort to break the Amun priesthood's stranglehold on religious interpretation and the economic resources that accompanied it. Shoshenq I later abolished hereditary priestly succession and mandated that all priests and God's Wives of Amun be appointed by the pharaoh, reducing their ability to act independently. Each reform was an attempt to reclaim authority from a position that had accumulated too much trust, too much economic power, and too much interpretive control.

The Egyptian case demonstrates that authority capture is not limited to individual actors inserting themselves into existing positions. It can also take the form of positional accumulation—the gradual expansion of a position's resources, influence, and interpretive authority until the position itself becomes the primary locus of power, regardless of who occupies it. The High Priests of Amun did not need to be individually ambitious in the way Richelieu or the Borgias were. The position itself had accumulated enough trust and enough economic infrastructure to function as an autonomous power center. Any occupant of the position inherited that infrastructure automatically, just as

any occupant of the papacy inherited fourteen centuries of accumulated institutional trust.

V. Beyond Monotheism: Authority Capture in East Asia

Japan's Warrior Monks: When the Temple Became the Army

Japanese Buddhism provides a case of authority capture that, at first glance, seems to defy the pattern's logic. Buddhist teaching is fundamentally oriented toward nonviolence, compassion, and detachment from worldly power. Yet for over six centuries, Japanese Buddhist monasteries fielded private armies of warrior monks—the sōhei—who fought territorial wars, intimidated the imperial court, imposed economic control over surrounding regions, and became so powerful that neither emperors nor shoguns could suppress them until Oda Nobunaga burned the Enryaku-ji monastery complex to the ground in 1571.

The mechanism was authority capture applied to institutional rather than individual positions. The Tendai school of Buddhism, headquartered at the Enryaku-ji complex on Mount Hiei outside Kyoto, accumulated enormous prestige through centuries of genuine spiritual and intellectual leadership. The monastery trained monks who went on to found virtually every other major school of Japanese Buddhism. Its relationship to the imperial court and aristocracy was intimate and longstanding. The institutional trust deposited through generations of legitimate religious service was immense.

That trust functioned as a verification override at the institutional level. Challenges to the monastery's expanding landholdings, economic activities, and eventually military operations were complicated by the population's deep conditioning to revere the institution as a center of spiritual authority. When Enryaku-ji's warrior monks marched into Kyoto fully armed to enforce their demands on the imperial government—which they did repeatedly from the tenth century onward—they did so carrying the sacred objects of the temple before them. The religious symbols functioned as tactical override: political and military authorities found it psychologically difficult to oppose men carrying the symbols of an institution they had been conditioned since childhood to revere.

By the thirteenth century, the Enryaku-ji complex owned most of the sake breweries and moneylending operations in Kyoto, providing both income and economic leverage. The

institution had captured the trust infrastructure of one of Japan's most respected religious traditions and deployed it in service of territorial control, economic extraction, and military power. The warrior monks were not monks who happened to fight. They were military-economic actors who exploited the verification override that attached to monastic robes and sacred objects.

The pattern was not limited to the Tendai school. The Ikkō-ikki, militant leagues associated with the Jōdo Shinshū sect of Pure Land Buddhism, rose in revolt against samurai lords and established autonomous self-rule in entire regions during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. These leagues explicitly combined religious authority—the trust infrastructure of Buddhist devotion—with military and political organization. Their name translated as "single-minded devoted league," and they were willing to fight and die for their faith. But the institutional structures they built were vehicles for political and territorial power that bore little resemblance to the contemplative spiritual practice that Pure Land Buddhism was designed to foster.

Imperial China: The Eunuchs and the Scholar-Officials

Imperial China presents the authority capture mechanism in what may be its most structurally revealing form, because the capture did not involve religious positions at all. Instead, it operated through the Confucian bureaucracy—a system of governance built on the claim that scholar-officials, selected through rigorous examination in the Confucian classics, possessed the moral and intellectual authority to govern. The verification override was not supernatural. It was meritocratic: the examination system deposited trust in the position of the scholar-official by certifying that its occupants had demonstrated mastery of the ethical and intellectual tradition that legitimated their authority.

The capturing actors, in this case, were the palace eunuchs—castrated men who served in the imperial household and who, through their intimate access to the emperor, repeatedly accumulated political power that rivaled or exceeded that of the credentialed bureaucracy. The tension between eunuchs and scholar-officials is one of the defining conflicts of Chinese political history, recurring across dynasties spanning two millennia.

The eunuchs' capture operated through a different mechanism than the cases examined so far. Rather than occupying the positions of symbolic authority themselves, the eunuchs exploited their proximity to the ultimate source of symbolic authority—the emperor—to bypass the trust infrastructure of the credentialed bureaucracy entirely. The emperor, as heaven's representative on earth, carried a verification override that trumped all others. The eunuchs, as the emperor's most trusted personal servants, could claim to represent the emperor's will—and this claim carried the emperor's override by proxy.

By the late Ming dynasty, the eunuchs had constructed a parallel bureaucracy of astonishing scale. From the early fifteenth century, they established their own administrative apparatus at court—complete with offices for taxation, intelligence, military oversight, and even a secret police force—that could filter information reaching the emperor and bypass the formal channels through which the scholar-officials governed. By the latter stages of the Ming, there were approximately 70,000 eunuchs, and they had established almost complete domination of the imperial court. Four of the dynasty's most infamous dictators were eunuchs.

The scholar-officials understood exactly what was happening and articulated it with precision. They recognized that the eunuchs were exploiting proximity to the emperor's verification override to circumvent the trust infrastructure that the examination system had built. The eunuchs, as personal attendants to the sovereign, always had his ear, and so were in a better position than even the most powerful minister to exercise influence and accumulate wealth. The scholar-officials' protests were, in effect, complaints about authority capture: actors who had not earned trust through the legitimate credentialing process (the examinations) were exploiting a shortcut (imperial proximity) to access the same or greater power that the credentialing system was designed to allocate based on demonstrated merit.

The Chinese case reveals that authority capture is not specific to religious institutions. Any system that accumulates trust in positions—whether through divine sanction, spiritual service, or meritocratic credentialing—creates resources that actors with different intentions can exploit. The mechanism is structural, not theological.

VI. The Universal Pattern: Convergent Evolution Toward Capture

When a Borgia cardinal in fifteenth-century Rome, an Umayyad governor in seventh-century Syria, a High Priest of Amun in twelfth-century-BCE Thebes, a warrior monk in medieval Kyoto, and a palace eunuch in Ming-dynasty Beijing all independently discover the same strategy—occupying or exploiting positions of accumulated symbolic authority to access trust infrastructure for purposes divergent from the position's original function—the consistency demands explanation. These civilizations had no meaningful contact with one another. They operated under radically different religious traditions, political systems, and cultural frameworks. Yet each produced the same pattern.

The explanation is convergent evolution. Just as wings evolved independently in birds, bats, and insects because flight solves the same aerodynamic problem regardless of the organism's lineage, authority capture emerges independently across civilizations because it solves the same political problem regardless of the culture's content: how to acquire and exercise power with minimal resistance from the population.

The problem is universal because its components are universal. Every complex society develops positions of symbolic authority that accumulate trust over time. Every such position creates a verification override that exempts its occupant from ordinary scrutiny. Every verification override represents an exploitable resource that strategic actors can identify and pursue. And every strategic actor who successfully captures such a position gains a decisive advantage over rivals who must build their own trust from scratch or maintain their power through force—because the captured position's trust infrastructure does the work automatically.

• • •

Several features of the pattern deserve emphasis because they recur so consistently across cases that they appear to constitute structural requirements of the mechanism.

The capture is most effective when invisible. In every case examined, the capturing actor's power depended on the population's continued belief that the position's occupant was serving its original function. Alexander VI's papacy worked as a vehicle for Borgia ambition only so long as the broader population continued to treat the papacy as a spiritual office. Richelieu's cardinalate shielded his political operations only so long as the robes continued to carry their accumulated trust. The Umayyad caliphate legitimated dynastic rule only so long as the title "Deputy of God" retained its religious resonance. When the gap between the position's function and the occupant's intention becomes publicly visible, the verification override degrades—which is precisely why capturing actors invest so heavily in maintaining the appearance of serving the position's original function.

The captured position's trust is consumed, not renewable, under capture conditions. Every case of authority capture documented here eventually degraded the institution's accumulated trust. The Borgia papacy contributed directly to the conditions that produced the Protestant Reformation. The Umayyad caliphate's perceived illegitimacy fueled Shia-Sunni divisions that persist to the present day. The Amun priesthood's power accumulation provoked Akhenaten's revolutionary attempt to destroy the institution entirely. Wolsey's exploitation of ecclesiastical authority contributed to the anticlerical reaction that enabled Henry VIII's break with Rome. Authority capture withdraws trust that was deposited by predecessors who served the position's genuine function. Once withdrawn, that trust is not replaced—because the capturing actor is not performing the service that deposited it in the first place. The capture is, in this sense, parasitic: it feeds on a resource it cannot regenerate.

The position's defenders are structurally disadvantaged. In every case, individuals who recognized the capture and attempted to defend the position's original function faced an asymmetric challenge. The capturing actor held the position's verification override—which meant that their claims were routed through the population's acceptance channel. The defenders, by contrast, were challenging a position the population had been conditioned to revere—which meant that their criticism was routed through the scrutiny channel and, worse, could be framed as an attack on the institution itself rather than on the occupant who was exploiting it. When

critics accused Alexander VI of corruption, they could be depicted as enemies of the Church. When scholars criticized the Umayyad caliphate, they could be accused of undermining Muslim unity. The override protected the capturing actor while exposing the defenders.

Capture begets capture. Once a position has been successfully captured, it becomes more likely to be captured again—because the institutional norms and selection processes that originally ensured the position was filled by individuals committed to its function have been weakened or destroyed. The Borgia papacy normalized the use of the office for family enrichment, making subsequent political papacies less shocking. The Umayyad caliphate established hereditary succession, making it easier for subsequent dynasties to treat the position as a political prize rather than a spiritual trust. The precedent of capture erodes the institutional defenses against future capture.

VII. The Structural Logic of Why These Positions, Specifically

A question that the cross-cultural evidence forces us to confront is why these particular positions—rather than others—attracted strategic capture. Every society contains positions of authority. Military commanders hold power. Judges adjudicate disputes. Administrators manage resources. Why were positions of symbolic or religious authority the preferred targets for capture, rather than secular offices that carried their own forms of power?

The answer lies in the unique properties of symbolic authority positions that make them qualitatively different from other forms of institutional power.

The first property is **depth of conditioning.** The verification override attached to religious and symbolic positions is installed earlier in life, reinforced more frequently, and embedded more deeply in the population's cognitive architecture than the override attached to secular positions. A child learns to revere the priest's collar before learning to respect the magistrate's authority. The conditioning is reinforced weekly through religious services, annually through holidays, and at every significant life event through ceremonies. By the time an individual encounters a secular authority figure, the religious override has already been operational for years or decades. The depth of this conditioning means that the verification override attached to religious positions is more durable, more resistant to challenge, and more difficult to consciously detect than any secular equivalent.

The second property is **scope of exemption.** Secular authority positions carry overrides that exempt specific domains from scrutiny: a judge's authority extends to legal matters, a general's to military decisions, an administrator's to bureaucratic procedure. But religious authority positions carry overrides whose scope is, in principle, unlimited. A priest can speak on matters of morality, politics, economics, family life, personal conduct, cosmic meaning, and the afterlife. A caliph's authority extends to every aspect of the community's existence. This breadth of scope means that an actor who captures a religious authority position gains a verification override that can shield operations across a far wider range of activities than any secular position could provide.

The third property is **resistance to accountability.** Secular authority positions are, at least in principle, subject to performance evaluation. A military commander who loses battles can be replaced. An administrator who fails to deliver services faces consequences. But religious authority positions claim connection to a domain—the divine, the cosmic, the transcendent—that is inherently unverifiable. A priest's claim to speak for God cannot be empirically tested. A caliph's assertion of divine mandate cannot be independently confirmed. This unverifiability means that the capturing actor faces far less accountability than would be possible in a secular position. The gap between the position's function and the occupant's intention is harder to demonstrate when the function itself involves claims that are beyond verification.

The fourth property is **intergenerational trust accumulation.** Secular positions accumulate trust over the tenure of individual occupants, and that trust largely dissipates when the occupant changes. A respected general's departure does not transfer his personal credibility to his successor. But religious and symbolic authority positions accumulate trust across centuries, building reserves that no individual lifetime could generate. When Richelieu put on the cardinal's robes, he accessed a trust infrastructure that had been building since the early centuries of Christianity. When the Umayyads claimed the caliphate, they accessed trust that the Prophet and his companions had deposited through decades of transformative spiritual leadership. No secular position could offer comparable returns on the investment of seeking it.

These four properties—depth of conditioning, scope of exemption, resistance to accountability, and intergenerational trust accumulation—explain why positions of symbolic authority are the preferred targets for authority capture across civilizations. The strategic actor seeking the most efficient path to power is drawn to these positions because they offer a verification override of unmatched depth, scope, durability, and resistance to challenge. The convergence across cultures is not coincidental. It reflects the convergent recognition, by strategic actors operating in radically different contexts, that symbolic authority positions offer the highest return on the investment of seeking them.

VIII. The Paradox of Institutional Success

The deepest implication of the authority capture mechanism is paradoxical: the better an institution serves its original function, the more vulnerable it becomes to capture.

An institution that fails to earn trust has nothing for a strategic actor to exploit. A discredited priesthood carries no verification override. A disrespected office confers no advantage on its occupant. The capturing actor gains nothing by occupying a position that the population has already learned to scrutinize. Capture is only attractive when the position carries substantial accumulated trust—and trust accumulates only through genuine service over time.

This means that the institutions most deserving of the trust they have earned are precisely the institutions most attractive to actors who intend to exploit that trust. The Catholic Church's fourteen centuries of genuine spiritual service to millions of people across Europe made the papacy the most valuable prize for a family like the Borgias. The early caliphs' transformative spiritual and political leadership of the Muslim community made the caliphate the most valuable position for a dynasty like the Umayyads. The Amun priesthood's centuries of faithful maintenance of Egypt's most important cult made the High Priesthood the most powerful position outside the pharaonic throne.

The paradox creates a dilemma for institutional design that no civilization in the historical record has fully resolved. Institutions need to accumulate trust to function effectively—a priesthood that no one respects cannot fulfill its coordinating and meaning-making roles; a credentialing system that carries no deference cannot serve its signal-verifying function. But the trust they accumulate creates a target. And the more successfully they accumulate it, the larger the target becomes.

Some civilizations attempted structural defenses. The early Islamic community's emphasis on selecting caliphs through consultation (*shura*) was, in part, an attempt to ensure that the position's occupant would be someone committed to its spiritual function rather than someone seeking to exploit its trust infrastructure. The attempt failed when the Umayyads imposed hereditary succession. The pharaonic practice of appointing High Priests directly was an attempt to maintain royal control over a

position that accumulated too much independent trust. The attempt eventually failed when the priesthood's economic resources made it effectively autonomous. The Catholic Church's elaborate procedures for papal election were, in part, designed to prevent any single family from capturing the office. The Borgias circumvented them through decades of patient positioning and strategic vote-gathering.

In each case, the institutional defenses were ultimately overcome because the capturing actor had a structural advantage: they understood the institution's trust infrastructure as an exploitable resource, while the institution's defenders understood it as a sacred trust to be protected. The capturing actor was willing to treat the position instrumentally—as a means to an end—while the defenders treated it reverentially, which constrained the measures they were willing to take in its defense. The asymmetry between instrumental and reverential orientations toward the same institution consistently favored the capturing actor.

• • •

This paradox does not counsel cynicism about institutional trust. Institutions that accumulate trust through genuine service perform functions that societies cannot do without: they coordinate behavior across populations too large for personal acquaintance, they provide frameworks of meaning that orient collective action, they signal competence and reliability in domains too complex for individual verification. The trust they accumulate is genuinely earned and genuinely valuable.

But understanding the authority capture mechanism means understanding that institutional trust is a resource—and like all resources, it attracts actors who would use it for purposes other than those for which it was created. The question is not whether authority capture will be attempted. The historical record demonstrates that it will be, across civilizations, religious traditions, and political systems. The question is whether institutions can develop structural defenses sophisticated enough to protect accumulated trust from actors who understand it as an exploitable resource rather than a sacred obligation.

The historical record, on this point, offers cautious grounds for measured hope. Institutions that survived authority capture—and many did—typically survived through reform: the Counter-Reformation responded to the Borgia papacy's degradation of the Church's trust; Islamic scholars developed theories of legitimate authority that constrained subsequent caliphal claims; Egyptian pharaohs periodically reasserted control over priestly appointments. Capture was not permanent. But reform came at a cost: some portion of the accumulated trust was always lost, and the institution that emerged from reform was never quite the institution that had existed before capture degraded it.

The authority capture mechanism is, in this sense, the structural shadow of institutional success. Where trust accumulates, capture follows. Where capture succeeds, trust degrades. Where trust degrades, reform becomes necessary. And where reform succeeds, trust begins to accumulate again—creating the conditions for the next cycle of capture. The cycle is not inevitable in any individual instance, but its recurrence across civilizations suggests that it reflects something fundamental about the relationship between institutional trust and strategic ambition in human societies.

IX. Implications: Recognizing Capture in Real Time

The historical examples examined in this paper share a feature that makes them relatively easy to analyze: they are over. The Borgia papacy ended five centuries ago. The Umayyad caliphate fell in 750. The warrior monks of Mount Hiei were destroyed in 1571. Distance provides clarity. We can see the gap between the position's function and the occupant's intention because the historical record reveals both.

The harder question is whether the authority capture mechanism can be recognized while it is operating—in real time, by the populations whose verification overrides are being exploited. The historical evidence on this point is both discouraging and instructive.

In every case examined, some contemporaries did recognize what was happening. Critics of the Borgia papacy documented Alexander VI's corruption in detail. Islamic scholars criticized the Umayyads as illegitimate usurpers from the dynasty's inception. Confucian officials identified the eunuchs' exploitation of imperial proximity and protested repeatedly across multiple dynasties. The Japanese imperial court understood that the warrior monks were using religious authority as cover for military-economic power. Recognition was not the problem. The problem was that recognition, by itself, could not overcome the verification override.

The override protected the capturing actor precisely because it routed criticism of the position's occupant through the same channel as criticism of the position itself. To challenge Alexander VI was to challenge the papacy. To challenge the Umayyad caliph was to challenge the caliphate. The capturing actor sheltered behind the position's accumulated trust, and critics who attacked the actor were perceived as attacking the institution. The population's conditioning—installed in childhood, reinforced through ritual, deepened through emotional bonding with the institution—made it psychologically difficult to distinguish between legitimate criticism of an occupant and illegitimate attack on the office.

This suggests that recognizing authority capture in real time requires something more than evidence of the capture itself. It requires the population to distinguish between the

position and the occupant—to maintain trust in the function while scrutinizing the individual who claims to serve it. This is precisely the distinction that the verification override is designed to collapse. The override transfers trust from the position to whoever occupies it, without requiring the evaluation that would separate legitimate occupants from capturing actors.

The cases that offer the most hope are those in which alternative institutions or information channels provided the population with a basis for comparison. The Protestant Reformation succeeded in breaking the papal verification override not primarily through theological argument but through the creation of competing symbolic systems that forced populations to choose—and the act of choosing reactivated the critical evaluation that the override had disabled. Morel's exposure of Leopold's Congo exploited alternative information pipelines that bypassed the monarch's controlled channels. In each case, the capture was exposed not by presenting evidence to a population whose override was active, but by disrupting the conditions that kept the override functioning.

The implication for contemporary institutions is sobering. Every position that has accumulated institutional trust—political offices, academic credentials, media authority, judicial appointments, financial regulatory bodies—is, by the logic of the authority capture mechanism, a potential target for actors whose intentions diverge from the position's original function. The trust is the target. The verification override is the vulnerability. And the population's inability to distinguish between legitimate occupants and capturing actors—because the override collapses precisely that distinction—is the mechanism through which the capture operates.

Understanding this mechanism does not prevent capture. But it does something that the historical populations examined in this paper lacked: it names the mechanism. It makes the pattern visible as a pattern rather than as a series of individual scandals, each appearing unique. And visibility—as every case of override disruption in this paper demonstrates—is the first step toward the structural reforms that can, if imperfectly and temporarily, defend accumulated institutional trust from actors who would exploit it for purposes its builders never intended.

X. Conclusion: The Capture Is the Pattern

A Borgia nephew manipulates four papal elections over thirty-five years before claiming the papacy as a vehicle for family enrichment. A French political operator seeks the cardinalate because he understands that the robes will make him invisible as a secular power broker. A butcher's son accumulates ecclesiastical titles because they carry a verification override that trumps the override attached to noble birth. A family that actively opposed the Prophet Muhammad seizes the caliphate and claims the title "Deputy of God" to legitimize dynastic rule. An Egyptian priesthood transforms the nation's most sacred religious office into an economic empire controlling two-thirds of all temple lands. Japanese Buddhist monks field private armies and operate sake breweries and moneylending operations from monasteries whose founders preached nonviolence and detachment from worldly concerns. Chinese palace eunuchs construct a parallel bureaucracy that rivals the credentialed Confucian civil service, exploiting proximity to the emperor's verification override to bypass the trust infrastructure of the examination system.

These are not similar stories. They are the same story. The content differs—the specific religious traditions, the cultural contexts, the historical periods, the individual ambitions. But the structure is identical: a position accumulates institutional trust through generations of genuine service, creating a verification override that exempts its occupant from ordinary scrutiny. A strategic actor recognizes this accumulated trust as an exploitable resource. The actor captures the position—through election, appointment, hereditary succession, or gradual institutional accumulation. And the captured position's trust infrastructure shields the actor's divergent intentions from the scrutiny that would expose them, because the population has been conditioned to defer to the position rather than to evaluate the occupant.

The consistency of this pattern across civilizations that had no contact with one another proves that it is not the product of any particular cultural tradition, religious system, or historical accident. It is a structural feature of how symbolic authority works in human societies. Wherever positions accumulate trust, capture will be attempted. Wherever capture succeeds, the accumulated trust will be consumed for purposes its depositors

never intended. And wherever trust is consumed without renewal, the institution will eventually face crisis—reform, revolution, or collapse.

Understanding this does not make the pattern avoidable. But it transforms the pattern from invisible to visible. And visibility—as every case in this paper demonstrates—changes what is possible. The populations who suffered under authority capture were not stupid, weak, or morally deficient. They were operating under verification overrides that had been legitimately earned through generations of genuine institutional service. The trust was real. The conditioning was deep. The override was functioning as designed.

What they lacked was a name for the mechanism. They could see corruption when it was blatant enough to exceed the override's absorption capacity. But they could not see the structural pattern—the way that institutional success itself creates the conditions for institutional capture. That pattern, once named and documented across civilizations, becomes part of the cognitive architecture available to subsequent populations. It does not disable the override. But it provides a framework for the question that every population must eventually learn to ask about every institution it trusts: is the occupant serving the function, or exploiting the infrastructure?

The answer will not always be clear. The question itself is the defense.

• • •

• • •

Bibliography

On the Borgia Papacy and Renaissance Church Politics

Pastor, Ludwig von. *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*. Multiple volumes. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1891–1953.

Mallett, Michael. *The Borgias: The Rise and Fall of a Renaissance Dynasty*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969.

Bradford, Sarah. *Cesare Borgia: His Life and Times*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1976.

On Richelieu and Early Modern French Politics

Bergin, Joseph. *Cardinal Richelieu: Power and the Pursuit of Wealth*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Knecht, R. J. *Richelieu*. London: Longman, 1991.

Church, William F. *Richelieu and Reason of State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

On Wolsey and Tudor England

Gwyn, Peter. *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey*. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990.

Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Cavendish, George. *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey*. Edited by Richard S. Sylvester and Davis P. Harding. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

On the Umayyad Caliphate and Early Islamic Authority

Hawting, G. R. *The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661–750*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2000.

Kennedy, Hugh. *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates*. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 2004.

Crone, Patricia, and Martin Hinds. *God's Caliph: Religious Authority in the First Centuries of Islam*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

On Egyptian Priesthoods and Pharaonic Authority

Teeter, Emily. *Religion and Ritual in Ancient Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Nims, Charles F. *Thebes of the Pharaohs: Pattern for Every City*. London: Elek Books, 1965.

Taylor, John H. *Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Egypt*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

On Japanese Buddhist Warrior Monks

Adolphson, Mikael S. *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.

Turnbull, Stephen. *Japanese Warrior Monks AD 949–1603*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2003.

On Chinese Eunuchs and Imperial Bureaucracy

Tsai, Shih-Shan Henry. *The Eunuchs in the Ming Dynasty*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Anderson, Mary M. *Hidden Power: The Palace Eunuchs of Imperial China*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1990.

Huang, Ray. *1587, A Year of No Significance: The Ming Dynasty in Decline*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Theoretical Foundations

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978 [1922].

Michels, Robert. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York: Free Press, 1962 [1911].

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Berger, Peter L. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.

Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

• • •

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations